

## **BOARD OF VETERINARY MEDICAL EXAMINERS**

### **Telephonic Board Meeting Minutes**

Date: May 25, 2005

Time: 10:00 a.m., C.S.T.

Location: Administrative Office  
First Floor, Cordell Hull Building  
425 Fifth Avenue North  
Nashville, TN 37247-1010

Members Present: Leland Davis, D.V.M., President  
Jerry Wilhite, D.V.M.  
Maben Thompson, D.V.M.  
Thomas Edmonds, D.V.M.  
Mary Welch, D.V.M., Vice-President  
Marie Gordon, Consumer Member

Members Absent: Mary Ann Grell, L.V.M.T., Secretary

Staff Present: Lisa Lampley, Board Director  
Brandi Bozarth, Office of General Counsel

Upon determination of a quorum, the telephonic meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. to consider the petition for reconsideration submitted by Dr. Sonny Reynolds, DVM, regarding the disciplinary Order entered by the Board at the April 21, 2005 meeting.

Roll call votes were conducted to ensure each participant was connected and that each participant could hear all responses. A motion was made by Dr. Davis, seconded by Ms. Gordon, to proceed with the telephonic meeting. The motion carried. A motion was made by Dr. Thompson, seconded by Dr. Welch, to find that the requirements for an electronic meeting had been met. The motion carried.

Ms. Brandi Bozarth, Assistant General Counsel, presented the response to the petition. Mr. C. Edward Fowlkes, Attorney, was present and represented Dr. Sonny Reynolds. Mr. Fowlkes stated that the Petition for Reconsideration was filed in order to receive further clarification of the order effective April 27, 2005.

Upon discussion, a motion was made by Dr. Wilhite, seconded by Dr. Edmonds, to grant the petition for reconsideration and amend the "Conclusions of Law" contained in the original order as follows:

"The Board found that the finding of fact regarding the use of superglue constituted no violation of the Veterinary Practice Act."

“The Board found that, based on the evidence presented in this case, the finding of fact regarding the animals coming out of an acceptable plane of anesthesia, constituted no violation of the Veterinary Practice Act.”

Respondent was ordered to practice veterinary medicine only under the supervision of another licensed veterinarian. Supervision in this case shall be defined as having a licensed veterinarian available and accessible, no more than forty-five (45) minutes from the location of the Respondent, and the supervising veterinarian must be physically present in the clinic at some time during any day the Respondent works. This definition is limited to the facts of this case and to the Respondent’s practice in a small animal clinic.

A roll call vote was conducted and the motion carried.

There being no further business to discuss, Dr. Wilhite made a motion, seconded by Dr. Edmonds, to adjourn the meeting at 10:55 a.m.

---

Mary Ann Grell, L.V.M.T, Secretary

---

Date

LL/G4055231/VMEmin